DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 941 HE 012 659

AUTHOR Monahan, William G.
TITLE Status Identities in Academic Education Units: A Q-Factor Analytic Exploration.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 45p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Characteristics; College Environment; *College Faculty; Deans; *Factor Analysis; Higher Education; Interprofessional Relationship; Private Colleges; *Q Methodology; Research Methodology; Schools of Education; State Colleges; *Status; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

Status identities in schools, colleges, and departments of education were investigated using Q-factor analysis. Ninety-six education professors, deans, and administrators involved in central roles (provosts for instruction or vice-presidents for academic affairs, and academic deans in smaller institutions) were studied. Large, small, public and private four-year schools were included. All subjects were characterized by institutional size, years of experience, institutional type, highest degree held, and whether they worked through the central office or in education programs. The study yielded 72 subjects for data applicable to factoring. Two Q-factor types were generated which, based on analysis of z-score arrays were labelled "The Assured Academic" and "The Threatened Academic." These two types are discussed and item-descriptions with descending z-scores are included for each as well as an array of z-scores which differentiate the types. The factor analytic methodology is explained and comments are included regarding the differences between Q-factoring and the more familiar R-factoring procedure. (Author/SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185941

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STATUS IDENTITIES IN ACADEMIC EDUCATION UNITS
A Q-FACTOR ANALYTIC EXPLORATION */

William G. Monahan, Dean
College of Human Resources and Education
West Virginia University

As is typically the case with an exploratory technique like Q-factor analysis, one thinks he is setting out to explore phenomena of a particular nature and in the process generates quite different configurations of ideas and patterns. One discovers, not unlike old Christopher Columbus, that where he thought he was going, turned out (sometimes much less fortuitously alas) to be a different world entirely.

I find myself again in that situation, for I thought I was developing a notion for getting at dimensions of comparative institutional complexity (with reference particularly to "Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education" (SCDE)--an emphasis which will be presently clear), and instead discovered a type of apparent "status deprivation identity" among faculty members and central institutional administrators in the Colleges and Universities I looked at.

The "SCDE" Issue as Precursor

In early 1975, I and others attended a UCEA/New York University seminar dealing with a generally similar topic at which time David Clark of Indiana University presented some provocative ad hoc reviews of his and his colleague, Egon Guba's, preliminary data from a massive study they are conducting under NIE sponsorship. During that presentation, Clark repeatedly referred to "Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education," (SCDE's). I found that rhetorical conglomerate terribly

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Monahan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AE01 2659

*/ I am particularly indebted to my good friend and former colleague, Dr. Albert Talbott, Professor of Journalism and Research at the University of Iowa, for his considerable assistance with this study. He rescued me from a tight spot by pumping my data through the QUANAL system at Iowa. Al is a consummate methodologist and interpreter; however, the inferences and observations are my own. Both of us owe our "Q addiction" to our mentor, the late Dr. Malcolm S. MacLean, Jr., with whom we both studied at Michigan State and with whom we later worked at Iowa. I wish that there were more space for me to acknowledge the benevolent influence of that gentle giant. His students learned from him that "ipsative" research begins with a profound respect for personhood.

I am also especially grateful to Ms. Donna Moore; as my secretary, she is now better at deciphering my penmanship than I am and her assistance was vital.

noisy in a communications sense and said as much in some comments I made there. In effect, I earnestly argued, there are so many organizational and phenotypic differences between "Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education" that to lump them all together is folly. That prompted me to think I might find some substance to my notion through a modest inquiry.

I must candidly admit that my exploration has disclosed, as a matter of fact, no basis whatsoever for challenging that "lumping" except that I likely asked the wrong questions. I still believe that the "SCDE" notion is not a useful invention but perhaps that is so axiomatic that it is not really important.

In any case, in the process of attempting to explore some aspects of that notion, I found something else that may or may not be related, but which is in some other ways a little disturbing. Using a Q-factor technique with an N of 72 academics, a factor type was generated which for lack of any more articulate way of describing it, suggests that numbers of academic "Educationists" are cynically insecure, lack confidence in themselves and their roles, have a decided sense of inferiority, are apparently convinced that the organizations they serve in are relatively impotent, that they and their colleagues are not considered very important across their campuses, and that structural considerations should have considerably more importance in organizational matters than people. I shall pursue these observations somewhat further on, for these characterizations do not do other than touch on the "high spots."

Some Methodological Considerations

With apologies for imposing on anyone's patience, it seems reasonably appropriate to take a little time to discuss the techniques I employed. Even though I have spent considerable time with so-called Q-methodology, I still feel occasionally compelled to defend it. And I am not entirely comfortable with that. Any kind of factor analysis is sticky business to say the least; to say the most, I claim no special identification as a statistician. In that regard, I am particularly conscious of something L.L. Thurstone observed in the "preface" to his MULTIPLE FACTOR ANALYSIS:

> If the scientist takes his numerical coefficients very seriously at the exploratory stage, he may be lacking in a desirable sense of humor about the crudeness of all his tools in spite of their polished appearance. (1)

I am not certain that he was taking a "pot-shot" at Q in that observation, but in terms of the controversy that has raged over R vs. Q in the past few decades, he certainly could have been. Even so, I do like the metaphor and I take it most thoughtfully to heart.

Let me merely suggest certain aspects of the methodology to fill the need for doing so and then pass on to my own inquiry utilizing it. It will remain for anyone so disposed to argue the merits pro and con.

First of all, Q is ipsative whereas R is normative. That simply means that in R, the focus of interest concerns how the subject deviates on a given item from the mean of all other subjects on that item. In Q, on the other hand, the focus of interest is with how a given item of a given person deviates from the mean of all other items for that person.

Factoring persons rather than items is of course not a new idea -- nor any more for that matter is Q-methodology a new idea except relatively.(2) Giants like Spearman, Thomson, Thurstone, and Bert have been associated with correlation of persons as variables from even the early 1900's. But it wasn't until about 1935--the exact year escapes me--that Godfrey Thomson and William Stephenson published papers explicitly recognizing the potential of factoring correlations between persons. With reference to this, Albert Talbott has observed that Thomson was "... quite pessimistic about this "new" methodology but Stephenson was quite optimistic." (3)

Kerlinger has said that, "... the main strength of Q is its close affinity to theory. Structured Q sorts, by definition, are theoretically oriented (and) another strength of Q is its usefulness in exploratory research." (4) It is the latter aspect that has guided most of my own interest with the techniques and which has constituted the basis for the present study as well. I said on another occasion several years ago that, "Q-methodology is eminently well-suited for generating person types not only because it employs factor analysis and uses persons as variables, but as well, because the factor types generated are in point of fact hypothetical persons." (5) It is a fundamental point often overlooked and constitutes the essence of the technique's ideology.

With reference to Kerlinger's observation about "sorts" it is important I think to point out that "sorting" is not a necessary condition with Q. Unquestionably the typical forced-choice Q-sort procedure has distinct advantages. In forced sorting, the quasi-normal distribution has distinct statistical advantages but generally requires interpersonal administration; i.e., the researcher assembles his subjects and administers the instrument or he finds them one at a time or, in any case, must usually administer the sort personally -- (we have had just abysmal results with trying to use sorts in mailed devices; the returns are typically low and much of the data unusable). (6)

The non-forced sort is exactly the reverse -- administration of the instrument is easy; lends itself to mailed procedures and incorporates a Likert-type scale. It does suffer some loss of statistical niceties. Yet, evidence substantially supports the notion that if the items are carefully designed, kurtosis presents no particularly disturbing problems.

Simply in virtue of a kind of mind-set, one is likely to have more of the variance accounted for in the first generated factor but, again, that is not hazardous -- at least no more so than with any other analytical method employing questionnaires.

Perhaps a word or two will clarify that issue. The forced sort procedure requires the subject to assign items to certain "piles" wherein he must put the several items (the precise number may vary) with which he most strongly agrees in one pile, the next several items with which he next most strongly agrees in another pile and so on until he has x number of piles each with specified numbers of items ranging across a number of piles (usually about five to seven). Each "pile" has enough additional items such that from a typical agree-to-disagree continuum, the total "set" of items constitutes a forced normal distribution. As with any other procedure, the level of discrimination is a function of the extent to which the researcher is able to write his items. With the non-forced procedure, the same conditions apply except that one lets his subjects respond as they may -- if they all tend to agree, one simply gets a gob of consensual items and quite obviously, a one factor solution. Yet there is within that procedure a way of partial forcing -- if you examine the instrument I used (see Appendix A), you will notice that I have allowed my respondents no opportunity to be neutral -- they must either agree or disagree. I have used similar patterns (as have many others) with Semantic Differential scales in which there is no 0 option, i.e., one uses an even numbered response category scheme wherein there is no opportunity to "halve" the scales. If a subject has real ambivalence with an item, he is likely to leave it blank -- one simply codesit as a "9" and it imposes no significant bias on the factor loadings providing, obviously, such ambivalence isn't chronic.

Of course it is always a useful and helpful step to pilot test the instrument. Having said that, I must admit that I did not do so in the present case. At the same time, however, the process itself is a method for refining instrumentation. One does this in a variety of ways -- he may analyze the "consensus" items and decide that if repeated runs are useful some of those items are not worthy of reiterating; he may find items on which there was such wide disparity that they are also not worthy of inclusion. Given available time, resources, and energy, the items can be factored.

In many situations, however, such concerns may simply not be important in terms of the interests that the researcher is pursuing. It is vital in Q to think in terms of its general theoretical value. Stephenson has put this perhaps better than anyone else. He said of the methodology that rather than hypothetico-deductive, it is postulatory-dependency. (7) Stephenson suggests, as a quite simple explication of that notion that, "The investigator puts his questions to the data, as testable propositions." (8)

Put another way, one can simply assert that Q is a worthy procedure for "trying-out" one's hunches, that it stands between theory and the reformulation of theory, and that it is particularly useful for any type

of exploration that might lead not to the testing hypotheses but to the formulation of them. It is thus generally acknowledged as a theorist's tool and a good one.

Selecting Samples and Analyzing Data

Typically, the number of people sampled is small and quite explicitly selected. This is congruent with Stephenson's characterization of the method as postulatory-dependency. The important notion is to attempt to get representatives of the pattern or views being studied. Randomly choosing a sample risks omitting some segments of a population that might be quite useful in the formulation or testing of an appropriate theoretical proposition.

With Q, a matrix of intercorrelations is formed by correlating every person's "sort" of items. A statistical program which suits this purpose was developed by Van Tubergen in the communications area at the University of Iowa known as QUANAL. (9)

The correlation matrix compares each person's pattern with that of all other persons. It is evaluated for principal component factors or principal axis factors; the former uses 1's for the diagonals in the matrix, and the latter uses communalities. The option is up to the user of course. In the present study, I used principal factors. The solution is then submitted to a Varimax (orthogonal) or Oblimax (oblique) rotation and again that choice is up to the user.

On this basis, a factor reflects a grouping of persons around a common pattern of item responses or sorts and thus a factor represents a "type" of person -- a hypothetical person to be sure; a caricature in a sense perhaps; more explicitly, this "type" is a mathematical distortion of what "real" people are like. It is thus a most useful invention. However, in order to avoid or to, at least, minimize the over-generalizeability of such factor types, other procedures are pursued which provide some "tightening" of the typal data.

The "type" factor matrix is thus weighted by weighting each item response of each person most highly associated with a given factor by the degree to which such persons are loaded on that factor. The higher the person's loading, the greater the weight. The formula for this is:

$$W_i = \frac{r_i}{1 - r_i} 2$$

where W_i = weight assigned to person i, and

r_i = highest factor loading for person i. (10)

From these weights, one obtains an array of "weighted item scores" for each "type" using the following equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} W_{ik} I_{ij} = WIS_{jk}$$

where: i = persons assigned to a particular type
j = item number
k = "type"
W = person weight
I = item score (determined by sort pile or by response category marked by subject
WIS = Weighted Item Score
n_k = number of persons assigned to a particular type.

Only persons in the same type have their item responses weighted and summed together to constitute the WIS for their particular type and the procedure is followed for each type. (11)

When the array of Weighted Item Scores (WIS) is determined for subjects in a study, there remain four more steps in the data treatment stage; I want to very briefly list those so that subsequent interpretations may be reasonably clear to the reader. I will then summarize all steps in the process hopefully to render the rather complicated procedure a little clearer.

--- the Weighted Item Scores (WIS) are standardized and converted to z-scores for each type separately. These are then ordered from "most accepted" to "most rejected" for each type thus providing an ordering of the test or sort items for each factor type.

--- each type is then comparable with each other type and in order to further facilitate this comparison, the data are displayed by z-scores "side-by-side" for each factor type, and a table is formed in descending order of these differences.

--- next, where appropriate (if more than two factors) we require that the items having a z-score (for a type) greater than those for other types be displayed and also for items for which a type has z-scores less than those of all other types.

--- finally, "consensus items" are listed and these are, in effect, all items defined as having a z-score difference among types of less than or equal to $\pm$ 1.00 z-score.

The latter issue is of some particular interest for among a variety of ways of analyzing and interpreting the data in Q and for probing at the characteristics of "types" there are as yet to my knowledge no precise and quantitatively "pure" procedures for determining statistically significant differences between types; this is clearly arguable since the simple process of extracting variances in the rotation of factors probably renders that issue irrelevant.* Nevertheless, when one wants to talk about differences among types, some people are always concerned with the scope or size or dimensions of such differences for quite obviously, even though two different factor types tend to "accept" an item or statement, some of the "types" accept it far less or far more than do others. (There are few "pure" types--most are "mixed.") By the same token, some items may be accepted by one type and rejected by another yet the z-score difference between these two types may be of such small magnitude that, (again depending on the discrimination built into the instrument), these differences may be so mild as to indicate only superficial information. Based therefore on reasonably pristine logic, it is typically presumed that a z-score difference of plus or minus 1.00 is a defensibly potent manifestation for characterizing real differences between person types. (12)

Summarizing the Procedures

In briefly reviewing the data treatment using this technique:

1. One selects from among subjects that seem to characterize the unique attributes or conditions which are appropriate to the theoretical notions being pursued and administers the instrument.
2. A matrix of intercorrelations is formed.
3. The matrix is factored using any familiar procedure and is rotated; again, using either orthogonal or oblique styles.
4. The "type" factor matrix is weighted.
5. An array of weighted item scores is generated for each person in each type.
6. The WIS's are standardized and converted to z-scores and these are then ordered.
7. Each type is compared by examining the differences in z-scores by items and by magnitude of said differences.
8. Finally, "consensus items" are determined and one then is free to probe the data for whatever information it apparently yields -- he may either test notions or formulate them accordingly.

---

* Stephenson and his "Q disciples" believe any such "decision-rules" should have no relevance to the methodology--the arrays of descending factor loadings define the "type." Why worry otherwise about probability coefficients? The interpretations are the responsibility of the researcher--the data "read themselves."

The Present Study

Perhaps I have provided far more information than anyone really wanted regarding the procedure; certainly it is considerably more than the rather modest study I have pursued probably deserves.

As with any type of inquiry mode, the initial design of the instrument is the major effort and requires the most careful thought and the most serious attention. As an aside, I think that perhaps the only truly vital aspect of funded research is that it should -- (I emphasize that because I am clearly aware that it doesn't always or perhaps even frequently) -- allow the researcher to give much more careful attention to instrument design. On the other hand, with Q and therefore one of its theoretical strenghts is that it does not necessarily demand the same rigor in item design that some other procedures require.

I frankly feel that particularly with reference to theory-building the risk of designing poor items is not only worth taking but probably should not even be a major concern. Yet, in any case, and even with great care, one always finds in his items curious ambivalences and "misses," or that subjects tend to write short essays on how lousy the items are and how they don't really have applicability to said subjects' functions, and so forth. A good deal of that kind of feedback is usually justified in almost any case as well.

With the instrument I used, if you examine the items, you will note that the intent was to build statements of belief that are "typically real;" by that I simply mean that one tries to design statements that, to the best of one's ability, "trigger" a reality-recognition-of-the-role; in some cases this quite clearly suggests that a single attitudinal posture is composed of several dimensions and even though those several dimensions, when incorporated in a single item, may, for some subjects, suggest a series of responses, for others they constitute a wholistic perception the several parts of which cannot be easily separated in their attitudinal or "belief-system" configurations. Ambivalence, where it seems reasonable, is thus deliberately built-in to the items.

In essence then, it is agreed that item design is always critical. I have also suggested, however, that both the excitement and the ultimate productivity of exploratory theoretical inquiry can be too easily inhibited by any obsessive caution regarding design of items and can foster such insecurities in the explorer that he or she gives up provocative ideas in the process. It is precisely because Q-methodology is a useful procedure for overcoming this concern that it has so much appeal for intelligent curiousity.

Some Characteristics of the Subjects

I sent out 96 instruments to incumbents in various higher education configurations -- these included small, medium sized, and large institutions, both public and private; included Deans of Schools of Education, Professors in Education units, and central administrative roles in instruction -- either academic deans in smaller institutions or academic V.P.'s, provosts, etc., in larger (and some of the medium sized) units. I also was interested in the length of experience at that institution that respondents had and whether the subject was "in" or "outside" the Education unit. In the latter case, as mentioned, only central administrators were "outsiders" for I provided no instruments to any other external roles. Within the Education units, instruments were provided for the dean or director and additional ones for other specified personnel within the Education unit.

The procedure elicited 72 useable returns for factoring even though in one or another isolated case, some of the identification data were omitted. Thus, the following table (Table I) suggests the general "make-up" of the subjects.

Consequently, one could talk about the sample in terms of the fact that except for "insiders/outsiders" and for extensiveness of experience, it falls rather generally across the broad classifications. That there is almost a 4:1 ratio of insiders to outsiders was a function of the distribution but reflects the distribution of instruments quite well. Of the ninety-six "targets" 22 were sent to "outsiders" thus the ratio of returns was about right. Of the total, the response reflected a return of about 73 percent which was pretty good. No further attempt was made to secure additional returns nor was that taken into consideration in any statistical treatment of them.

Regarding the "experience" kurtosis, I have no way of explaining that pattern. Perhaps it is merely a vagarie of the distribution or it may simply suggest that staffs in Education units are much more stable and not many "new" people are being appointed. Although the N of those with one year of experience is much too small to deal with (n=3), whether it makes a difference in the distribution of the factor types when combined with data for other experience categories simply cannot be inferred. I'd guess it doesn't -- it might be worth finding out but if (for example) one might want to propose the notion that one year in an "SCDE" is not yet long enough to be either co-opted by others or to yet decide whether to be co-opted, is moot. I have no pressing hunches about that which I'd like to pursue -- perhaps anyone exposed to these comments might.

Statistical Tests

One can submit data to any type of appropriate test as a general consequence of whatever demographic information is secured from the sample. The researcher usually wants to know whether a particular factor type is significantly likely to be identified from a particular milieu. The

TABLE I

Characteristics of Subjects

STATUS [a]	
Insiders	59
Outsiders	13
INSTITUTIONAL SIZE [b]	
Small	36
Medium	12
Large	23
EXPERIENCE [c]	
One Year	3
Two-Five Yrs.	15
Five plus	52
INSTITUTIONAL TYPE	
Public	49
Private	17
BY HIGHEST DEGREE GRANTED BY INSTITUTION [d]	
Bachelors only	9
MA and/or Ed.S.	32
Doctorate	26

a/ Refers to whether or not the subject was employed by the School, College or Department of Education or was "outside" that unit -- by target, the latter were all central instruction or academic officers.

b/ These categories referred to the total size of the institution and not merely to the size of the Education unit. Categories were under 4,000 students: Small; to 12,000 students; Medium; over 12,000: Large.

c/ Experience is typical; i.e., how long the subject had been employed at the particular institution.

d/ Some small institutions by category do offer advanced degrees; this was to determine that aspect. Perhaps in virtue of the sample selected it nevertheless held that no small classified institutions offered the doctorate and not enough of the medium-sized ones to mention. It is accurate to conclude that the small institutions offered only the BS and or the MA (fewer of the latter), medium-sized institutions offered the M.A. and/or the Ed.S., and the large institutions offered the doctorate. This pattern is so clear that exceptions are not worth considering.

Wallace study that I previously referred to, for example,sought to test the notion that factor-generated learning types from a sample of different classrooms were likely to include significantly more high or low achievers and more males than females.

Such tests are primarily a function of the notions that the researcher has; as with any other study which postulates that a population or a sample is characterized in some unique fashion apart from chance, Q is equally appropriate. The difference is quite obviously that one first has generated certain types of hypothetical persons and on that basis, the researcher then wants to know certain things about the character of these types based on other variables. The particular tests performed must obviously conform to appropriate statistical conditions and the choice of procedures is governed only by that.

Based on the two factor solution that was generated in this study, a Chi Square procedure was executed in which the data were distributed by factor types according to the demographic variables. One can conclude that only the designation of "insider/outsider" is significant. Thus it doesn't seem to matter at all whether the size, or type of institution, whether it offers only a baccalaureate degree or the doctorate, nor whether one has been at said institution one year or more than five is any basis for characterizing the factor types. However, whether one is employed within an Education unit turns out to be instructive in the characterization of the factor types.

I utilized an Alpha level of .10 for the simple reason that due to the exploratory nature of such a study, the risks of making a type II error (retaining a false hypothesis) are more serious than making a type I error. But in the case of the "insider/outsider" variable, even a tighter Alpha criterion would have made little difference. All other measures were very mild. The following table suggests the pattern. (Table II).

According to Table II, there appears to be a "tendency" for Factor #2 to be much more strongly identified with public rather than with private institutions, but these data are not significantly supportive of that notion. Again, however, one of the values of the technique is that such notions provide trails of investigation and one recognizes that his "numbers" may account for either lack of decisiveness or contribute to it. Such "patterns" mark a basis for probing further.

It is curious to me at least that there is such a clear definition of Factor #2 with reference to the Education units. Now this quite obviously does not suggest that were a similar exploration made among faculty members and administrators within Arts and Sciences units or Engineering units or what have you, that one might not elicit a similar type. Since no other identifying characteristic elicited information, that hypothesis may surely be worth pursuing. But it does suggest interesting avenues of speculation and such additional inquiry would indeed be useful for similar types of institutions.

TABLE II

Factor Types By Variables [a/]

Factor Type	Status		Size			Experience			Type		Degree-granted		
	I	O	S	M	L	1	2-5	5+	Pb	Pvt	BS	MA+	Ph.D.
Factor #1	38	12	26	8	16	2	10	38	35	13	19	21	8
Factor #2	21	1*	10	4	7	1	5	14	14	4	7	11	1
Totals	59	13	36	12	23	3	15	52	49	17	26	32	9

(*Chi Square significant at .10)

[a/] Some totals do not equal the 72 total persons factored since some subjects omitted certain unique demographic characteristics. Any subject who omitted more than one such variable was not included.

Yet what we have is at the least a measure of the identifications and belief patterns that a collectivity of faculty and/or administrators in Education units express and in and of itself that provides some insight. About thirty percent of my total sample have identified with this hypothetical factor (#2) considering only a two factor solution, that is substantial; and of that total, all but one of them are "insiders." Moreover, it seems reasonably apparent that they spread across all types of institutions, public, private, large, small, and graduate, undergraduate. Interesting.

The Nature of the Types

Accordingly then, let us examine certain aspects of these two types of hypothetical persons with which our real people identify.

Type #1 - The Assured Academic

Naming one's factor types is hazardous business but I tend to be more comfortable with morphemics. The "Assured Academic" (Type #1) represents a little less than 70 percent of the subjects responding to the items. This type as can be seen from the descending array of z-scores in Table III is reasonably comfortable with the role. He believes that the faculty in the Education unit takes pride in its identification with that unit, that it doesn't feel especially left-out of things, that resources-allocation

TABLE III

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING
ARRAY OF Z-SCORES FOR TYPE 1 [a/]

	ITEM DESCRIPTION	Z-SCORE
40.	MOST OF THE PEOPLE I KNOW IN THE EDUCATION FACULTY TAKE THEIR WORK IN TEACHER PREPARATION VERY SERIOUSLY AND WORK VERY HARD AT IT.	2.309
39.	I THINK ALMOST ALL OF OUR FACULTY IN EDUCATION WOULD BE VERY UPSET IF SUCH PROGRAMS WERE DISCONTINUED EVEN IF FACULTY WERE ASSURED OF CONTINUED TENURE.	1.850
36.	IF THIS INSTITUTION WERE TO BE REDESIGNATED AS A TEACHERS COLLEGE PROBABLY MOST OF THE FACULTY EVEN IN EDUCATION WOULD OBJECT.	1.645
2.	WITH REFERENCE TO THE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES, EDUCATION IS TREATED AS WELL AS OR BETTER THAN OTHER PROGRAM AREAS.	1.626
37.	I THINK MOST OF THE FACULTY ASSIGNED TO EDUCATION PROGRAMS HERE TAKE IMMENSE PRIDE IN THAT IDENTIFICATION.	1.542
3.	IN TERMS OF FACULTY WHO HAVE SOME INFLUENCE IN OVER-ALL POLICY-MAKING, EDUCATION FACULTY ARE GENERALLY VERY IMPORTANT.	1.502
51.	I BELIEVE OUR PRESENT ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND PROCESS GIVES EVERYBODY A CHANCE TO HAVE HIS/HER SAY IN THINGS.	1.483
1.	PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE MORE IMPORTANT AND VISIBLE IN THIS INSTITUTION THAN TYPICALLY. (YOUR PERCEPTION)	1.449
64.	I GENERALLY FEEL THAT I KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON AND I HEAR ABOUT THINGS SOONER THAN MOST.	1.432
18.	EVEN THOUGH SOME PEOPLE ARE HIGHER IN THE GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL HEIRARCHY THAT I AM, I KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON ABOUT AS QUICKLY AS THEY DO.	1.408
55.	I THINK ADMINISTRATORS TRY VERY HARD TO HELP EVERYBODY IN THE EDUCATION UNIT TO BECOME INVOLVED AND TO INFLUENCE DECISIONS AFFECTING PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT.	1.406
15.	IN THE GENERAL STRUCTURE OF THINGS, EDUCATION FACULTY ARE PRETTY MUCH IN THE KNOW AROUND HERE.	1.297
63.	I THINK THINGS IN GENERAL AROUND HERE ORGANIZATIONALLY AND ADMINISTRATIVELY SO FAR AS EDUCATION IS CONCERNED ARE A LOT BETTER THAN MOST PEOPLE WOULD ADMIT.	1.297
33.	MOST OF OUR STAFF DON'T ESPECIALLY FEEL LEFT-OUT SO FAR AS KNOWING ABOUT WHAT'S GOING ON THAT AFFECTS THEM OR THEIR PROGRAMS.	1.264
9.	FACULTY IN THE EDUCATION UNIT HERE GENERALLY TAKE EXPRESSIVE PRIDE IN THEIR PLACE IN THINGS AND SEE THEMSELVES AS A LEADING CONSTITUENCY.	1.245
16.	THERE IS A FAIRLY EFFECTIVE INFORMATION-FLOW PATTERN IN THIS INSTITUTION.	1.212
53.	I THINK BEING ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES IN THE EDUCATION UNIT HELPS THOSE PEOPLE TO INFLUENCE WHAT GOES ON.	1.179
4.	PERSONALITIES ARE IMPORTANT VARIABLES IN THE RELATIVE STATUS OF PROGRAMS BUT IN OUR CASE EDUCATION IS HIGHLY IMPORTANT REGARDLESS OF LEADERSHIP BECAUSE OF INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT.	1.073

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

68.	I THINK A DRASTIC REORGANIZATION OF THE EDUCATION UNIT HERE IS NOW ESSENTIAL.	-1.023
59.	I AM CONVINCED THAT WE DON'T REALLY GET OUR FAIR SHARE OF THE BETTER STUDENTS COMING INTO THE INSTITUTION.	-1.167
67.	I THINK OUR RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER ACADEMIC UNITS AND PROGRAMS ARE BEING TOO MUCH, AND INCREASINGLY, DETERMINED BY THEM AND NOT US.	-1.174
50.	EVEN THOUGH I'M IN A ROLE SUPPOSEDLY VITAL TO PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, I OFTEN FEEL I AM NOT CONSULTED.	-1.179
38.	IF THE MAJORITY OF OUR FACULTY COULD BE ASSURED OF CONTINUING EMPLOYMENT, I THINK THEY WOULDN'T BE AT ALL DISTURBED IF EDUCATION PROGRAMS WERE DISCONTINUED.	-1.184
57.	I THINK THE GREAT BULK OF COMMITTEE WORK IS NOT GIVEN MUCH SERIOUS ATTENTION BY THE DEAN OR CHAIRMAN.	-1.501
17.	IF ANYTHING IMPORTANT IS BEING PROPOSED, EDUCATION FACULTY ARE THE LAST TO HEAR ABOUT IT.	-1.741
58.	I REALLY DEEP-DOWN DON'T LIKE BEING IDENTIFIED WITH EDUCATION HERE BECAUSE TOO MANY OF OUR STAFF IN THAT UNIT ARE PRETTY WEAK.	-1.920

[a] only items are included for which the z-score is ± 1.00.

is at least fair, that the organizational structure is reasonably open, and that the flow of information is open and accessible.

Clearly many of those who identify with factor #2 feel similarly about some of the items strongly held by the Assured Academic but there are other items on which there is considerable difference. I will get at those presently.

The Assured Academic doesn't feel that any drastic reorganization is called for; he does not believe that Education students are any worse -- (perhaps no better; we didn't ask that) -- than others coming into the institution; that relationships with other academic units are satisfactory; that committee work is reasonable and reasonably valued; and that in general he doesn't really mind at all being associated and affiliated with the Education program; takes some pride in it as a matter of fact.

Factor Type #2 -- The Threatened Academic

An examination of Table IV suggests that the "Threatened Academic," like his colleagues, feels that people in the Education unit take their work very seriously and would be unhappy if their programs were discontinued. On the other hand, these 30+ percent of the study subjects are convinced that people outside the Education unit have little notion of what the Education unit contributes to their work; believe they have much less control over their own destiny, believe that committee assignments have much more to do with influence, that central administrators don't give Education a very serious view when resource-allocation decisions are made, that people who are "like them" are not valued enough, that their students aren't perceived as being very influential (though they are pretty good) that it's difficult to get cooperation in program areas outside the Education unit, and that, by general attitude, the notion that teacher education is a dominating concern of the institution is almost laughable.

Some Cautions in Interpretation

Some generalized characterizations of any factor type must be seriously qualified. The fact that many people, in response to an instrument, indicate that they think or feel or believe that their program area is, for example, not "getting their fair share of the better students coming in to the institution" may quite simply be a matter of verifiable fact for that institution; by the same token, faculty quite nicely adjusted, secure, and as generally satisfied with their lot-in-life as one can possibly be in the academy in these trying times (and regardless of field or area) might, with equal argument, demonstrate that with reference to the allocation of resources, they also are being short-shrifted.

The point is simply that when compared with others in similar roles and in a variety of different kinds of institutions, some such "belief systems" tend to set them somewhat apart and that when combined with

TABLE IV

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING
ARRAY OF Z-SCORES FOR TYPE 2 [a]

	ITEM DESCRIPTION	Z-SCORE
40.	MOST OF THE PEOPLE I KNOW IN THE EDUCATION FACULTY TAKE THEIR WORK IN TEACHER PREPARATION VERY SERIOUSLY AND WORK VERY HARD AT IT.	2.251
39.	I THINK ALMOST ALL OF OUR FACULTY IN EDUCATION WOULD BE VERY UPSET IF SUCH PROGRAMS WERE DISCONTINUED EVEN IF FACULTY WERE ASSURED OF CONTINUED TENURE.	2.150
46.	I'M CONVINCED THAT PEOPLE OUTSIDE EDUCATION AREN'T MADE TO REALIZE HOW MUCH EDUCATION PROGRAMS CONTRIBUTE TO THE OVERALL GENERATION OF STUDENT-CREDIT-HOURS.	1.657
21.	A LOT MORE DECISIONS ARE NOW BEING MADE THAT EFFECT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS THAT EVEN OUR OWN FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION HAVE LITTLE CONTROL OVER.	1.602
36.	IF THIS INSTITUTION WERE TO BE REDESIGNATED AS A TEACHERS' COLLEGE PROBABLY MOST OF THE FACULTY EVEN IN EDUCATION WOULD OBJECT.	1.522
47.	I BELIEVE TOO MUCH ATTENTION IS GIVEN TO THE BUSINESS OF DECLINING MARKETS FOR TEACHERS.	1.413
53.	I THINK BEING ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES IN THE EDUCATION UNIT HELPS THOSE PEOPLE TO INFLUENCE WHAT GOES ON.	1.375
44.	I BELIEVE THAT AUTHORITIES IN CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION DO NOT TAKE EDUCATION SERIOUSLY ENOUGH IN TERMS OF RESOURCES-ALLOCATION.	1.098
52.	I THINK IT DOESN'T MATTER MUCH WHO ONE IS OR WHAT ONE DOES, THE MAJOR ISSUES AFFECTING EDUCATION PROGRAMS HERE ARE BEYOND THE EDUCATION UNIT'S CONTROL.	1.010
8.	TEACHER PREPARATION IS PERCEIVED HERE AS ONLY ONE AMONG VARIOUS PROGRAM OPTIONS--NEITHER MORE NOR LESS IMPORTANT THAN OTHERS.	1.010
4.	PERSONALITIES ARE IMPORTANT VARIABLES IN THE RELATIVE STATUS OF PROGRAMS BUT IN OUR CASE EDUCATION IS HIGHLY IMPORTANT REGARDLESS OF LEADERSHIP BECAUSE OF INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT.	-1.014
41.	I BELIEVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS HERE DO NOT ENOUGH VALUE CONTRIBUTIONS OF PEOPLE IN MY KIND OF ROLE.	-1.052
38.	IF THE MAJORITY OF OUR FACULTY COULD BE ASSURED OF CONTINUING EMPLOYMENT, I THINK THEY WOULDN'T BE AT ALL DISTURBED IF EDUCATION PROGRAMS WERE DISCONTINUED.	-1.188
10.	STUDENTS COMING INTO EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE GENERALLY PERCEIVED AS HAVING TO BE BETTER THAN THE AVERAGE AT THE INSTITUTION.	-1.307
11.	STUDENTS IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS TYPICALLY DOMINATE IN INFLUENCE IN STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS.	-1.349
59.	I AM CONVINCED THAT WE DON'T REALLY GET OUR FAIR SHARE OF THE BETTER STUDENTS COMING INTO THE INSTITUTION.	-1.385
12.	PROGRAM REVISIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULA INVOLVING NON-EDUCATION CONTENT ARE NOT TOO DIFFICULT TO EFFECT HERE.	-1.644
7.	A TEACHER'S COLLEGE REPUTATION IS LOOKED UPON HERE GENERALLY AS A GENUINE STRENGTH.	-2.163

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

58.	I REALLY DEEP-DOWN DON'T LIKE BEING IDENTIFIED WITH EDUCATION HERE BECAUSE TOO MANY OF OUR STAFF IN THAT UNIT ARE PRETTY WEAK.	-2.525
14.	I WOULD SURMISE THAT THE OVERALL COMMITMENT TO TEACHER EDUCATION DOMINATES THIS INSTITUTION'S PURPOSES.	-2.893

[a] only items on which there is a z-score of $\pm$ 1 are included in this table.

the ways they feel about a collectivity of issues, such attitudes identify them with a hypothetical type of person which suggests at the least that they are threatened. Given all that, it doesn't mean that they (Factor #2's) do not have ample reason for being melancholy. It is reliably reported that even paranoids have enemies!

The fact is that apparently, and regardless of type, size, or scope of the institution, there are sizeable proportions of academic educationists -- (for significant numbers of these Threatened Academics are in Education units) -- are decidedly insecure. And that conclusion is not alone a function of the z-score arrays for that type but is supported as well in virtue of a cursory examination of the items that clearly differentiate them from the Assured Academics. Table V presents the z-score differences between the two types considering only magnitudes of $\pm$ 1.00. Resource allocation is primary; but differences in other areas, (though both types may tend to "fall" on the same side of the issue) reflect the intensity of the attitude. By comparison accordingly, there is far less pride and satisfaction between the types; there are important differences between their views of the extent to which they feel identification with or "part" of the organization; and there are important differences in their belief patterns about the relationship of the Education unit's leadership with reference to the prosperity of the institution regardless of the relativity of that. On the negative side, the differences, though less scopal, still reflect a differential pattern of "easiness," or "uneasiness" depending on one's interpretation.

Consensually, the two types have many views in common and these are useful mainly in highlighting any possible theoretical notion for additional inquiry and for both types ascertaining areas of agreement. Both believe not enough attention is given to teaching. Interestingly, although it was not an easy matter to pursue, the evidence seems to suggest that this was a fairly universal feeling; i.e., it seemed no more nor less a matter of belief in small nor in large institutions. In no case was it a really strong sentiment but it was more accepted than rejected. I'd privately guess that such a view would probably elicit a similar response were it to be put to any faculty in any institution. Many of the other consensus items are also in the order of "things" that one might generally expect persons of different persuasions to agree on. Some of the items for which consensus was generated were heavily influenced by some of the variables in the instrument distribution. For example, the item (#23) with reference to advisor frustration as a consequence of procedural charges was heavily "loaded" by subjects in the large and medium sized institutions. As one might hopefully expect, it elicited neither support nor rejection from small institutions and their reaction was generally kind of "ho-hum." Whether that means that such institutions make fewer changes or simply that such changes are better understood is moot. These kinds of questions, though they are typically the kinds of notions that the procedure evokes are not so easy to pursue since one has to pour over the print-outs. Yet simply through some prior attention to coding, they can be "teased-out" of the data. And it is through the "pouring-over"

TABLE V

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING ARRAY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TYPES 1 AND 2 [a/]

		1	2	DIFFERENCE
2.	WITH REFERENCE TO THE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES, EDUCATION IS TREATED AS WELL AS OR BETTER THAN OTHER PROGRAM AREAS.	1.626	-0.972	2.598
14.	I WOULD SURMISE THAT THE OVERALL COMMITMENT TO TEACHER EDUCATION DOMINATES THIS INSTITUTION'S PURPOSES.	-0.310	-2.893	2.583
51.	I BELIEVE OUR PRESENT ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND PROCESS GIVES EVERYBODY A CHANCE TO HAVE HIS/HER SAY IN THINGS.	1.483	-0.948	2.431
12.	PROGRAM REVISIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULA INVOLVING NON-EDUCATION CONTENT ARE NOT TOO DIFFICULT TO EFFECT HERE.	0.477	-1.644	2.121
4.	PERSONALITIES ARE IMPORTANT VARIABLES IN THE RELATIVE STATUS OF PROGRAMS BUT IN OUR CASE EDUCATION IS HIGHLY IMPORTANT REGARDLESS OF LEADERSHIP BECAUSE OF INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT.	1.073	-1.014	2.087
7.	A TEACHER'COLLEGE REPUTATION IS LOOKED UPON HERE GENERALLY AS A GENUINE STRENGTH.	-0.086	-2.163	2.077
3.	IN TERMS OF FACULTY WHO HAVE SOME INFLUENCE IN OVER-ALL POLICY-MAKING, EDUCATION FACULTY ARE GENERALLY VERY IMPORTANT.	1.502	-0.454	1.956
5.	EDUCATION'S STATUS IN THE WHOLE SCHEME OF THE INSTITUTION HAS PROSPERED PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF OUR LEADERSHIP'S STYLE.	0.637	-0.926	1.563
18.	EVEN THOUGH SOME PEOPLE ARE HIGHER IN THE GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL HEIRARCHY THAN I AM, I KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON ABOUT AS QUICKLY AS THEY DO.	1.408	-0.094	1.502
9.	FACULTY IN THE EDUCATION UNIT HERE GENERALLY TAKE EXPRESSIVE PRIDE IN THEIR PLACE IN THINGS AND SEE THEMSELVES AS A LEADING CONSTITUENCY.	1.245	-0.191	1.436
1.	PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE MORE IMPORTANT AND VISIBLE IN THIS INSTITUTION THAN TYPICALLY. (YOUR PERCEPTION)	1.449	0.096	1.353
33.	MOST OF OUR STAFF DON'T ESPECIALLY FEEL LEFT-OUT SO FAR AS KNOWING ABOUT WHAT'S GOING ON THAT AFFECTS THEM OR THEIR PROGRAMS.	1.264	-0.085	1.349
64.	I GENERALLY FEEL THAT I KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON AND I HEAR ABOUT THINGS SOONER THAN MOST.	1.432	0.09.	1.341

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING ARRAY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TYPES 1 AND 2 [a/]

55.	I THINK ADMINISTRATORS TRY VERY HARD TO HELP EVERYBODY IN THE EDUCATION UNIT TO BECOME INVOLVED AND TO INFLUENCE DECISIONS AFFECTING PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT.	1.406	0.072	1.334
10.	STUDENTS COMING INTO EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE GENERALLY PERCEIVED AS HAVING TO BE BETTER THAN THE AVERAGE AT THE INSTITUTION.	-0.012	-1.307	1.295
11.	STUDENTS IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS TYPICALLY DOMINATE IN INFLUENCE IN STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS.	-0.188	-1.349	1.160
15.	IN THE GENERAL STRUCTURE OF THINGS, EDUCATION FACULTY ARE PRETTY MUCH IN THE KNOW AROUND HERE.	1.297	0.189	1.108
37.	I THINK MOST OF THE FACULTY ASSIGNED TO EDUCATION PROGRAMS HERE TAKE IMMENSE PRIDE IN THAT IDENTIFICATION.	1.542	0.492	1.050
35.	IN THIS INSTITUTION, WE'VE PERCEIVED A DECIDED SHIFT AWAY FROM VERY MUCH IMPORTANCE GIVEN TO EDUC. PROG. EVEN THOUGH PERCEPT. AMONG MOST PEOPLE HERE IS PROG. STILL REFLECT MOST VISIBLE SOURCES OF PRES. AND FUNCTION	-0.699	0.304	-1.003
22.	TOO FREQUENTLY NOW AS COMPARED TO THE RECENT PAST, FACULTY OR STAFF WHO ARE SOMEWHAT OUTSIDE THE INNER-SANCTUM DON'T QUITE KNOW HOW TO RESPOND TO NEW PROCEDURES.	-0.688	0.324	-1.012
47.	I BELIEVE TOO MUCH ATTENTION IS GIVEN TO THE BUSINESS OF DECLINING MARKETS FOR TEACHERS.	0.394	1.413	-1.019
19.	FREQUENTLY HERE, SOME PEOPLE WHO ARE FAIRLY HIGH-UP IN THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE DON'T KNOW ABOUT THINGS THAT ARE BEING CONSIDERED UNTIL THEY ARE DECIDED.	-0.991	0.113	-1.104
28.	PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN DEPARTMENTAL OR COLLEGE DECISIONS BECAUSE OF THEIR POSITIONS IN THE HEIRARCHY GENERALLY SEEM NO MORE WELL-INFORMED THAN OTHERS.	-0.791	0.321	-1.113
6.	THIS INSTITUTION'S GENERAL AND TRADITIONAL COMMITMENT TO EDUCATION PROGRAMS HAS DECLINED PRIMARILY DUE TO EXPLICIT PLANS TO CHANGE THE IMAGE OF THE PLACE.	-0.857	0.447	-1.304

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING ARRAY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TYPES 1 AND 2 [a]

57.	I THINK OUR RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER ACADEMIC UNITS AND PROGRAMS ARE BEING TOO MUCH, AND INCREASINGLY, DETERMINED BY THEM AND NOT BY US.	-1.174	0.172	-1.347
56.	I FEEL THAT EVEN SOME PEOPLE IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE HIERARCHY AREN'T INCLUDED IN SOME IMPORTANT DECISION-MAKING MATTERS.	-0.569	0.785	-1.354
60.	I THINK OUR COLLEAGUES IN DEPARTMENTS OUTSIDE THE EDUCATION UNIT DON'T REALLY HAVE MUCH RESPECT FOR US.	-0.664	0.718	-1.381
49.	I AM CONVINCED THAT TOO MANY DECISIONS ARE MADE WHICH DO NOT GET A FULL ENOUGH HEARING BY THOSE WHO REALLY DO THE WORK.	-0.501	0.964	-1.465
13.	COOPERATION WITH LIBERAL ARTS FACULTY REGARDING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IS MORE DIFFICULT NOW THAN IN THE PAST.	-0.792	0.823	-1.615
21.	A LOT MORE DECISIONS ARE NOW BEING MADE THAT EFFECT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS THAT EVEN OUR OWN FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION HAVE LITTLE CONTROL OVER.	-0.139	1.602	-1.741
46.	I'M CONVINCED THAT PEOPLE OUTSIDE EDUCATION AREN'T MADE TO REALIZE HOW MUCH EDUCATION PROGRAMS CONTRIBUTE TO THE OVERALL GENERATION OF STUDENT-CREDIT-HOURS.	-0.146	1.657	-1.803
52.	I THINK IT DOESN'T MATTER MUCH WHO ONE IS OR WHAT ONE DOES, THE MAJOR ISSUES AFFECTING EDUCATION PROGRAMS HERE ARE BEYOND THE EDUCATION UNIT'S CONTROL.	-0.865	1.010	-1.875
44.	I BELIEVE THAT AUTHORITIES IN CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION DO NOT TAKE EDUCATION SERIOUSLY ENOUGH IN TERMS OF RESOURCES-ALLOCATION.	-0.833	1.098	-1.931

[a] only items are included for which there is a z-score of $\pm$ 1.

TABLE VI

37 CONSENSUS ITEMS AND AVERAGE Z-SCORES [a]

	ITEM DESCRIPTION	AVERAGE Z
40.	MOST OF THE PEOPLE I KNOW IN THE EDUCATION FACULTY TAKE THEIR WORK IN TEACHER PREPARATION VERY SERIOUSLY AND WORK VERY HARD AT IT	2.280
39.	I THINK ALMOST ALL OF OUR FACULTY IN EDUCATION WOULD BE VERY UPSET IF SUCH PROGRAMS WERE DISCONTINUED EVEN IF FACULTY WERE ASSURED OF CONTINUED TENTURE.	2.000
36.	IF THIS INSTITUTION WERE TO BE REDESIGNATED AS A TEACHERS COLLEGE PROBABLY MOST OF THE FACULTY EVEN IN EDUCATION WOULD OBJECT.	1.583
53.	I THINK BEING ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES IN THE EDUCATION UNIT HELPS THOSE PEOPLE TO INFLUENCE WHAT GOES ON.	1.277
63.	I THINK THINGS IN GENERAL AROUND HERE ORGANIZATIONALLY AND ADMINISTRATIVELY SO FAR AS EDUCATION IS CONCERNED ARE A LOT BETTER THAN MOST PEOPLE WOULD ADMIT.	0.993
8.	TEACHER PREPARATION IS PERCEIVED HERE AS ONLY ONE AMONG VARIOUS PROGRAM OPTIONS--NEITHER MORE NOR LESS IMPORTANT THAN OTHERS.	0.901
16.	THERE IS A FAIRLY EFFECTIVE INFORMATION-FLOW PATTERN IN THIS INSTITUTION.	0.799
48.	I BELIEVE THERE ARE PEOPLE IN OUR STAFF WHOSE POTENTIAL FOR INFLUENCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION IS NOT RECOGNIZED ENOUGH.	0.737
32.	IT'S APPARENTLY EASY FOR PEOPLE INVOLVED IN VARIOUS DECISION-MAKING FUNCTIONS TO OVERLOOK SOME STAFF WHO OUGHT TO BE INFORMED ABOUT THOSE DECISIONS.	0.443
42.	I BELIEVE THAT IN THE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES, NOT ENOUGH CONSIDERATION IS GIVEN TO TEACHING.	0.437
69.	IF THE EDUCATION UNIT WERE REORGANIZED, I'D LIKE TO SEE STRUCTURE GIVEN MORE EMPHASIS THAN CERTAIN PEOPLE.	0.272
24.	WHEN STAFF WHO HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO ADVISE STUDENTS OR TO WORK WITH SOMETHING DIFFERENT AREN'T MADE CLEARLY AWARE OF IT, THEY HAVE TO REACT BY WHAT THEY THINK RATHER THAN WHAT THE SYSTEM REALLY WANTS.	0.267
43.	I BELIEVE THAT THE FACTORS AFFECTING RESOURCES-DECISIONS FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS WITH THE EDUCATION UNIT ARE NOT WELL UNDERSTOOD BY FACULTY	0.137

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

26.	IT SEEMS TO BE TRUE THAT BY THE TIME SOMETHING DECIDED GETS TO SOME PEOPLE WHO"VE LITTLE TO DO WITH IT, IT'S PRETTY BADLY DISTORTED.	0.009
54.	I BELIEVE THAT BEING ON CERTAIN IMPORTANT COMMITTEES CAUSES PEOPLE TO ENDORSE THINGS THEY MIGHT OTHERWISE OPPOSE.	-0.079
29.	THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE EDUCATION UNIT HERE IS NOT VERY COMPLEX AND SINCE THERE ARE ONLY A FEW PEOPLE INVOLVED IN DECISION-MAKING, THERE SEEMS TO BE LESS DISTORTION OF INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.	-0.146
61.	I THINK SOME OF OUR COLLEAGUES OUTSIDE EDUCATION RATHER STRONGLY RESENT THE GENERALLY HIGH STATUS THAT EDUCATION ENJOYS HERE.	-0.177
23.	PEOPLE WHOSE JOB IT IS TO ADVISE STUDENTS ARE INCREASINGLY FRUSTRATED BY CHANGES IN PROCEDURES OR REQUIREMENTS THAT THEY DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT.	-0.200
31.	WE PROBABLY OUGHT TO HAVE MORE MEETINGS OF STAFF HERE IN ORDER FOR EVERYBODY TO KNOW MORE ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON.	-0.288
65.	I THINK THAT THERE IS FAR LESS AUTONOMY OVER OUR WORK AND PROGRAMS THAN WE OUGHT TO HAVE AS A GOOD ACADEMIC UNIT.	-0.377
30.	THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE IS FAIRLY COMPLEX (E.G., THERE ARE SEVERAL ASST. DEANS, DEPT. CHRPRSNS, COMMITS, AND PROBLEMS WITH NON-EDUCATION CURRIC. PERSONNEL) THUS IT'S MUCH MORE DIF. TO KNOW WHAT'S EXPECTED.	-0.397
62.	I THINK PEOPLE GENERALLY--BOTH INSIDE AND OUTSIDE EDUCATION--BELIEVE THAT EDUCATION OVERALL ISN'T VERY STRONG.	-0.397
70.	I DON'T REALLY SEE ANYTHING PARTICULARLY WRONG WITH THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE BUT CERTAIN PEOPLE OUGHT TO BE CHANGED.	-0.406
25.	ONE REALLY KNOWS MORE ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON HERE IF HE/SHE IS JUST OFFICED CLOSER TO PEOPLE WHO MAKE DECISIONS.	-0.472
27.	ONE THING SEEMS SURE--IN THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS HERE, THERE HAS BEEN A LOT OF CONFUSION AMONG FACULTY ABOUT WHAT IS EXPECTED OF THEM IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.	-0.489
34.	SINCE OUR EDUCATION COMPONENT IS NOT VERY INFLUENTIAL IN THE WHOLE SCHEME OF THINGS, OUR PROBLEM IS GETTING ENOUGH ATTENTION RATHER THAN TOO MUCH.	-0.519
20.	SINCE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION IS VERY IMPORTANT HERE, THINGS THAT AFFECT NON-EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE FREQUENTLY PERCEIVED BY THOSE NON-EDUCATION PEOPLE AS BEING DONE WITHOUT THEIR IN-PUT.	-0.523

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

45.	I BELIEVE THOSE IN OUR STAFF--FACULTY AND ALMINISTRATION--WHO HAVE INFLUENCE IN THE INSTITUTION DO NOT FIGHT HARD ENOUGH FOR OUR FAIR SHARE RESOURCES.	-0.528
50.	EVEN THOUGH I'M IN A ROLE SUPPOSEDLY VITAL TO PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, I OFTEN FEEL I AM NOT CONSULTED.	-0.719
68.	I THINK A DRASTIC REORGANIZATION OF THE EDUCATION UNIT HERE IS NOW ESSENTIAL.	-0.774
66.	I BELIEVE A LOT MORE COULD BE ACCOMPLISHED IF THERE WAS LESS INTERFERENCE WITH WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO IN EDUCATION AND PEOPLE INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE EDUCATION UNIT WOULD JUST LEAVE US BE.	-0.873
41.	I BELIEVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS HERE DO NOT ENOUGH VALUE CONTRIBUTIONS OF PEOPLE IN MY KIND OF ROLE.	-0.885
57.	I THINK THE GREAT BULK OF COMMITTEE WORK IS NOT GIVEN MUCH SERIOUS ATTENTION BY THE DEAN OR CHAIRMAN.	-1.177
38.	IF THE MAJORITY OF OUR FACULTY COULD BE ASSURED OF CONTINUING EMPLOYMENT, I THINK THEY WOULDN'T BE AT ALL DISTURBED IF EDUCATION PROGRAMS WERE DISCONTINUED.	-1.186
59.	I AM CONVINCED THAT WE DON'T REALLY GET OUR FAIR SHARE OF THE BETTER STUDENTS COMING INTO THE INSTITUTION.	-1.276
17.	IF ANYTHING IMPORTANT IS BEING PROPOSED, EDUCATION FACULTY ARE THE LAST TO HEAR ABOUT IT.	-1.315
58.	I REALLY DEEP-DOWN DON'T LIKE BEING IDENTIFIED WITH EDUCATION HERE BECAUSE TOO MANY OF OUR STAFF IN THAT UNIT ARE PRETTY WEAK.	-2.223

[a] Criterion is 1.000

that certain provocative things are likely to occur. Accordingly, I should like to begin to close this paper with some such notions.

The Concept of Status-Deprivation

In his excellent book concerned with theoretical dimensions of the origins of economic growth, Everett Hagen spends some time dealing with the notion of the "withdrawal of status respect." He states as a general proposition that the fact, "... that status shall be satisfying requires not that it is high but merely that it is deemed appropriate by the person occupying it and (that it is) respected by others." (p. 185) He goes on to point out what is fundamentally obvious to anyone knowledgeable about status -- that it is "one's destiny — one's identity (and) includes his purposes and values in life." (13)

Hagen was concerned about the relatively powerful forces which tend to disrupt traditional patterns of behavior in culture such as displacement by force or dramatic technological change and so forth. But "hitch-hiking" somewhat on his theory, it occurred to me that somewhat less than the rather critical "withdrawal of status respect" that he discusses in an anthropological sense there is a kind of "middle-ground" in status decline that may be equally meaningful. I have called it "status deprivation." I mean by it very simply that there are a variety of conditions and situations that may persuade some persons in some roles that their generally expected role-definitions of their own status is now such as to be characterized in their own perceptions as "deprived." It may well be that such perceptions are only fleeting manifestations of "mid-life crises" or some other ideosyncratic conditions. But on the other hand, such belief patterns may portend more significant role behaviors. That there is some measure of feeling on the part of some academic Educationists -- (a syndrome of attitudes that I have characterized as Threatened Academics) -- seems at least possible. That it may be studied within the notion of status deprivation seems useful for clearly there may be many within the academy in all fields who deeply feel some measure of such status-deprivation. The causes and origins of that condition seem worthy both of our interest and our concerns for these are people who may populate all types of institutions. That they feel such deprivations of their professional identities surely requires us to at least probe further; at best it suggests that we must find ways of reassuring these types or with as much certitude as is humanly possible to recruit much more confident and optimistic people.

I can only conclude on the basis of this very exploratory and tentative inquiry that there are far more "gloomy Guses" inhabiting our Educational establishments than I ever dared believe -- either that or, given the alternate hypothesis, Educationists are just significantly likely to either perceive themselves as unworthy or they simply are.

In other words, they feel that way because they are that way. I hope not.

Some Further Suggestions

This small exploration certainly raises some questions on which further analysis would perhaps shed some light.

Do other "outsiders" identify similarly with those in Factor #1? Or do they identify proportionately similar to both factors? Do other "outsiders" tend to view the Educationists similarly as they view themselves? In a sense, this question simply pursues the notion of whether my factor types are generalizeable academics or unique to Education units.

How do students view the Education unit in terms of some Q-generated data? Do they internalize dimensions of these same faculty/administrator types?

Is there any relationship between the general areas of expertise and the factor types? In other words, is a professor of, say Math Education, more likely to identify one way or another as compared to a professor of Elementary Education?

Looking at some of the items among the 22 subsumed under "Internal Hierarchy" -- those for which the factor loadings were plus or minus 1 z-score or for which the differences between types were of that magnitude -- is there some pattern of interest? I think there might be. For example, items 15, 17, 18, 19, 22 and 28 are such items. Let's look at these items as in Table IV.

TABLE III

Item		Assured Academic z-score	Threatened Academic z-score	Difference
15	Ed. Faculty "in-know"	1.297	.189	1.108
17	Ed. Faculty last to hear	-1.741	-.889	-.851
18	Others higher-up but I know	1.408	-.094	1.502
19	Higher-ups don't know	-.991	.113	-1.104
22	Outside "Inner Sanctum"	-.688	.324	-1.012
28	Position no basis - Information	-.791	.321	-1.113

These items all suggest differential perceptions of what one might call status isolation. The "Threatened Academic" seems to feel, at least when compared with the more secure type, that he and people like him, are somewhat removed from the "flow-of-things" -- from information "lines," influence, and decisions. It would be interesting to know where such

people really are in the organization and what are their primary tasks. Thus whether there may be something which tends to cause these types to respond to many organizational issues more in terms of what is "in" them rather than what is "in" the organization -- a notion somewhat congruent with Talcott Parsons' "Self-Collectivity" pattern-variable. (14)

Is there something about public institutions as compared to private ones which suggests further inquiry about the types? Although in the present study, the distribution of "Threatened Academics" in such institutions was not statistically significant, one clearly "sees" the possibility with a larger N. Perhaps, for example, there is a different role-expectation internalized; private institutions may either screen-out the Threatened Academics or they may simply select docile people.

The docility notion is also provocative. Perhaps the "Assured Academic" is, after all, only a docile type who exhibits no real interest or concern in "sticking-out-the-neck." It would be most instructive to correlate types with scholarly productivity and style; it may well be that the Threatened Academic is much more productive (in whatever sense of that measure is appropriate) than his counterpart. Similarly, the Threatened Academic may be both more visible and more aggressive in university politics. He may be much more active as a change-agent than the Assured Academic.

Finally, and without prolonging this discussion, there is a difference between my two factor types with reference to an issue that Professor Perrow has frequently discussed -- "Structure vs. People" in organizational interests. I posed the notion (item #69) that if the Education unit were reorganized, structure be given more consideration than people. The Threatened Academics were much more accepting of this than were the Assured Academics. The z-score difference (-.72) characterized it as a consensus item by definition. Still, Factor I was strongly opposed to it and one wonders whether such views are characteristics of a kind of "humanistic" ideology on the one hand or whether "people" are more cynically mistrusted (by FactorII) on the other.

Clearly, one need be wary of presuming syndromes of behavioral patterns; i.e., that because a "type" generated by the procedure seems characteristically insecure, it is a mistake to conclude that those identifying with that hypothetical person are thereby "structuralists" rather than "humanists." The temptation is, indeed, to assign such associative "guilt." Yet, it may well be more a matter of one's experiences within a particular organizational configuration which prompts that belief-system rather than something embedded in the personality. Such curiousities can only be assuaged by further probing. All one really gets in any such initial analysis are cues -- where it ultimately leads, either in terms of theoretical postulates or ideosyncratic investigation, remains to the investigator. Typically, both concerns are likely to be pursued and in the processes of that pursuit, syndromes are either demonstrated or they are rejected in favor of other more implicative explanations.

The Four Factor Solution

This study also generated a four "types" pattern. I have not had ample opportunity to examine that data very much. It is reasonably clear, however, that the four-factor solution really "breaks-down" the two major factors into two sets of sub-types. I will be looking at those later on and beyond that, at this point, I can't say very much else.

A Final Comment

Based on an exploratory investigation of 72 subjects utilizing Q-technique, and ranging across different types and sizes of institutions, a two-factor solution was generated. These factor types have been characterized and discussed in the paper.

Conclusions from such an analysis are always tentative, yet one is at least struck by the differences between the factor types and by the significant inclusion in Factor #2 of persons holding academic appointments in Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education. That these types tend to fall across all types and sizes of institutions suggests that such institutional variables are not important in identifying the types, but that affiliation with the Education unit is.

Perhaps then, after all, the notion of "SCDE's" is a more meaningful organizational collectivity than I thought.

NOTES

(1) L. L. Thurstone. Multiple Factor Analysis. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1949. p. xi.

(2) William Stephenson's The Study of Behavior - (Q-Technique and Its Methodology), was published by the University of Chicago Press in 1953 only six years after Thurstone's significant revision and expansion of his The Vectors of Mind was also published by the same press as Multiple Factor Analysis.

(3) Albert Talbott, "Q-Technique and Its Methodology: A Brief Introduction and Consideration." New York: Paper presented at Q-Methodology Symposium, American Educational Research Association, 1971.

(4) Fred N. Kerlinger. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964. pp. 592-3.

(5) W. G. Monahan, "The Generation of Typological Categories in the Study of Different Administrative Issues and Affinity of Q for Theory-Building," New York: Paper presented at Q-Methodology Symposium, American Educational Research Association, 1971.

(6) Ibid. p. 5.

(7) William Stephenson. The Study of Behavior (Q-Technique and Its Methodology). Chicago: University of Chicago Press., 1953, p. 17.

(8) Ibid., p. 39.

(9) N. G. Van Tubergen. Q-Analysis: QUANAL. Iowa City: Mass Communications Research Bureau, School of Journalism, The University of Iowa, 1969.

(10) The derivation of this formula is referred to in Stephenson, Op. Cit., p. 120.

(11) See, e.g., Malcolm S. MacLean, Jr., Thomas Danbury, and Albert Talbott. Civil Defense Belief Patterns. East Lansing: Department of General Communications Arts, Michigan State University, 1964. And, Edward F. Wallace. "Student Learning Types as Generated by Q-Factor Analysis," Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Division of Educational Administration, University of Iowa, July 1972. pp. 47-48.

(12) I am hard-pressed to cite the reasoning for this arbitrariness. I know only that we have seemingly always done it in Q and I think Stephenson has discussed it somewhere; but I reread Study of Behavior carefully in search of it without a "hit." I confess I don't know how such a notion came to be other than that as a quantitative idea in measurement, it simply seems generously reasonable. Stephenson

probably invented it merely to satisfy those of us who are anxious about such curious issues as how big is "big" and how small is "small."

(13) Everett E. Hagen. On the Theory of Social Change. (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, Inc.) 1962. Chapter 9, p. 185 ff. See also (by the same author) "How Economic Growth Begins: A General Theory Applied to Japan," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. XXII, No. 3 (Fall, 1958), pp. 373-90.

(14) See e.g., W. G. Monahan. Theoretical Dimensions of Educational Administration. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1975. pp. 156-158.

APPENDICES

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS	TYPAL Z'S 1	2
N'S FOR EACH TYPE ARE	50	22
1. PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE MORE IMPORTANT AND VISIBLE IN THIS INSTITUTION THAN TYPICALLY. (YOUR PERCEPTION)	1.4	0.1
2. WITH REFERENCE TO THE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES, EDUCATION IS TREATED AS WELL AS OR BETTER THAN OTHER PROGRAM AREAS.	1.6	-1.0
3. IN TERMS OF FACULTY WHO HAVE SOME INFLUENCE IN OVER-ALL POLICY-MAKING, EDUCATION FACULTY ARE GENERALLY VERY IMPORTANT.	1.5	-0.5
4. PERSONALITIES ARE IMPORTANT VARIABLES IN THE RELATIVE STATUS OF PROGRAMS BUT IN OUR CASE EDUCATION IS HIGHLY IMPORTANT REGARDLESS OF LEADERSHIP BECAUSE OF INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT.	1.1	-1.0
5. EDUCATION'S STATUS IN THE WHOLE SCHEME OF THE INSTITUTION HAS PROSPERED PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF OUR LEADERSHIP'S STYLE.	0.6	-0.9
6. THIS INSTITUTION'S GENERAL AND TRADITIONAL COMMITMENT TO EDUCATION PROGRAMS HAS DECLINED PRIMARILY DUE TO EXPLICIT PLANS TO CHANGE THE IMAGE OF THE PLACE.	-0.9	0.4
7. A TEACHER'S COLLEGE REPUTATION IS LOOKED UPON HERE GENERALLY AS A GENUINE STRENGTH.	-0.1	-2.2
8. TEACHER PREPARATION IS PERCEIVED HERE AS ONLY ONE AMONG VARIOUS PROGRAM OPTIONS--NEITHER MORE NOR LESS IMPORTANT THAN OTHERS.	0.8	1.0
9. FACULTY IN THE EDUCATION UNIT HERE GENERALLY TAKE EXPRESSIVE PRIDE IN THEIR PLACE IN THINGS AND SEE THEMSELVES AS A LEADING CONSTITUENCY.	1.2	-0.2
10. STUDENTS COMING INTO EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE GENERALLY PERCEIVED AS HAVING TO BE BETTER THAN THE AVERAGE AT THE INSTITUTION.	-0.0	-1.3
11. STUDENTS IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS TYPICALLY DOMINATE IN INFLUENCE IN STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS.	-0.2	-1.3
12. PROGRAM REVISIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULA INVOLVING NON-EDUCATION CONTENT ARE NOT TOO DIFFICULT TO EFFECT HERE.	0.5	-1.6
13. COOPERATION WITH LIBERAL ARTS FACULTY REGARDING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IS MORE DIFFICULT NOW THAN IN THE PAST.	-0.8	0.8
14. I WOULD SURMISE THAT THE OVERALL COMMITMENT TO TEACHER EDUCATION DOMINATES THIS INSTITUTION'S PURPOSES.	-0.3	-2.9
15. IN THE GENERAL STRUCTURE OF THINGS, EDUCATION FACULTY ARE PRETTY MUCH IN THE KNOW AROUND HERE.	1.3	0.2
16. THERE IS A FAIRLY EFFECTIVE INFORMATION-FLOW PATTERN IN THIS INSTITUTION.	1.2	0.4
17. IF ANYTHING IMPORTANT IS BEING PROPOSED, EDUCATION FACULTY ARE THE LAST TO HEAR ABOUT IT.	-1.7	-0.9
18. EVEN THOUGH SOME PEOPLE ARE HIGHER IN THE GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL HEIRARCHY THAN I AM, I KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON ABOUT AS QUICKLY AS THEY DO.	1.4	-0.1
19. FREQUENTLY HERE, SOME PEOPLE WHO ARE FAIRLY HIGH-UP IN THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE DON'T KNOW ABOUT THINGS THAT ARE BEING CONSIDERED UNTIL THEY ARE DECIDED.	-1.0	0.1
20. SINCE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION IS VERY IMPORTANT HERE, THINGS THAT AFFECT NON-EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE FREQUENTLY PERCEIVED BY THOSE NON EDUCATION PEOPLE AS BEING DONE WITHOUT THEIR IN-PUT.	-0.6	-0.5
21. A LOT MORE DECISIONS ARE NOW BEING MADE THAT EFFECT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS THAT EVEN OUR OWN FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION HAVE LITTLE CONTROL OVER.	-0.1	1.6

	ITEM DESCRIPTIONS	TYPAL	Z'S
22.	TOO FREQUENTLY NOW AS COMPARED TO THE RECENT PAST, FACULTY OR STAFF WHO ARE SOMEWHAT OUTSIDE THE INNER-SANCTUM DON'T QUITE KNOW HOW TO RESPOND TO NEW PROCEDURES.	-0.7	0.3
23.	PEOPLE WHOSE JOB IT IS TO ADVISE STUDENTS ARE INCREASINGLY FRUSTRATED BY CHANGES IN PROCEDURES OR REQUIREMENTS THAT THEY DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT.	-0.6	0.2
24.	WHEN STAFF WHO HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO ADVISE STUDENTS OR TO WORK WITH SOMETHING DIFFERENT AREN'T MADE CLEARLY AWARE OF IT, THEY HAVE TO REACT BY WHAT THEY THINK RATHER THAN WHAT THE SYSTEM REALLY WANTS.	0.1	0.5
25.	ONE REALLY KNOWS MORE ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON HERE IF HE/SHE IS JUST OFFICED CLOSER TO PEOPLE WHO MAKE DECISIONS.	-0.6	-0.4
26.	IT SEEMS TO BE TRUE THAT BY THE TIME SOMETHING DECIDED GETS TO SOME PEOPLE WHO'VE LITTLE TO DO WITH IT, IT'S PRETTY BADLY DISTORTED.	-0.2	0.2
27.	ONE THING SEEMS SURE--IN THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS HERE, THERE HAS BEEN A LOT OF CONFUSION AMONG FACULTY ABOUT WHAT IS EXPECTED OF THEM IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.	-0.8	-0.2
28.	PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN DEPARTMENTAL OR COLLEGE DECISIONS BECAUSE OF THEIR POSITIONS IN THE HEIRARCHY GENERALLY SEEM NO MORE WELL-INFORMED THAN OTHERS.	-0.8	0.3
29.	THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE EDUCATION UNIT HERE IS NOT VERY COMPLEX AND SINCE THERE ARE ONLY A FEW PEOPLE INVOLVED IN DECISION-MAKING, THERE SEEMS TO BE LESS DISTORTION OF INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.	0.3	-0.6
30.	THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE IS FAIRLY COMPLEX (E.G.,THERE ARE SEVERAL ASST.DEANS,DEPT.CHRPRSNS, COMMITS, AND PROBLEMS WITH NON-EDUCATION CURRIC.PERSONNEL) THUS IT'S MUCH MORE DIF. TO KNOW WHAT'S EXPECTED.	-0.6	-0.2
31.	WE PROBABLY OUGHT TO HAVE MORE MEETINGS OF STAFF HERE IN ORDER FOR EVERYBODY TO KNOW MORE ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON.	-0.6	0.0
32.	IT'S APPARENTLY EASY FOR PEOPLE INVOLVED IN VARIOUS DECISION-MAKING FUNCTIONS TO OVERLOOK SOME STAFF WHO OUGHT TO BE INFORMED ABOUT THOSE DECISIONS.	-0.0	0.9
33.	MOST OF OUR STAFF DON'T ESPECIALLY FEEL LEFT-OUT SO FAR AS KNOWING ABOUT WHAT'S GOING ON THAT AFFECTS THEM OR THEIR PROGRAMS.	1.3	-0.1
34.	SINCE OUR EDUCATION COMPONENT IS NOT VERY INFLUENTIAL IN THE WHOLE SCHEME OF THINGS, OUR PROBLEM IS GETTING ENOUGH ATTENTION RATHER THAN TOO MUCH.	-0.8	-0.2
35.	IN THIS INSTITU.,WE'VE PERCEIVED A DECIDED SHIFT AWAY FRM VERY MUCH IMPORTANCE GIVEN TO EDUC.PROG. EVEN THOUGH PERCEP.AMONG MOST PEPLE HERE IS PROG.STILL REFLCT MOST VISIBLE SOURCES OF PRES. AND FUNCTION.	-0.7	0.3
36.	IF THIS INSTITUTION WERE TO BE REDESIGNATED AS A TEACHERS' COLLEGE PROBABLY MOST OF THE FACULTY EVEN IN EDUCATION WOULD OBJECT.	1.6	1.5
37.	I THINK MOST OF THE FACULTY ASSIGNED TO EDUCATION PROGRAMS HERE TAKE IMMENSE PRIDE IN THAT IDENTIFICATION.	1.5	0.5
38.	IF THE MAJORITY OF OUR FACULTY COULD BE ASSURED OF CONTINUING EMPLOYMENT, I THINK THEY WOULDN'T BE AT ALL DISTURBED IF EDUCATION PROGRAMS WERE DISCONTINUED.	-1.2	-1.2
39.	I THINK ALMOST ALL OF OUR FACULTY IN EDUCATION WOULD BE VERY UPSET IF SUCH PROGRAMS WERE DISCONTINUED EVEN IF FACULTY WERE ASSURED OF CONTINUED TENURE.	1.9	2.2

	ITEM DESCRIPTIONS	TYPAL Z'S	
40.	MOST OF THE PEOPLE I KNOW IN THE EDUCATION FACULTY TAKE THEIR WORK IN TEACHER PREPARATION VERY SERIOUSLY AND WORK VERY HARD AT IT.	2.3	2.3
41.	I BELIEVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS HERE DO NOT ENOUGH VALUE CONTRIBUTIONS OF PEOPLE IN MY KIND OF ROLE.	-0.7	-1.1
42.	I BELIEVE THAT IN THE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES, NOT ENOUGH CONSIDERATION IS GIVEN TO TEACHING.	-0.0	0.9
43.	I BELIEVE THAT THE FACTORS AFFECTING RESOURCES-DECISIONS FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS WITH THE EDUCATION UNIT ARE NOT WELL UNDERSTOOD BY FACULTY.	0.0	0.2
44.	I BELIEVE THAT AUTHORITIES IN CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION DO NOT TAKE EDUCATION SERIOUSLY ENOUGH IN TERMS OF RESOURCES-ALLOCATION.	-0.8	1.1
45.	I BELIEVE THOSE IN OUR STAFF--FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION--WHO HAVE INFLUENCE IN THE INSTITUTION DO NOT FIGHT HARD ENOUGH FOR OUR FAIR SHARE RESOURCES.	-1.0	-0.1
46.	I'M CONVINCED THAT PEOPLE OUTSIDE EDUCATION AREN'T MADE TO REALIZE HOW MUCH EDUCATION PROGRAMS CONTRIBUTE TO THE OVERALL GENERATION OF STUDENT-CREDIT-HOURS.	-0.1	1.7
47.	I BELIEVE TOO MUCH ATTENTION IS GIVEN TO THE BUSINESS OF DECLINING MARKETS FOR TEACHERS.	0.4	1.4
48.	I BELIEVE THERE ARE PEOPLE IN OUR STAFF WHOSE POTENTIAL FOR INFLUENCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION IS NOT RECOGNIZED ENOUGH.	0.5	1.0
49.	I M CONVINCED THAT TOO MANY DECISIONS ARE MADE WHICH DO NOT GET A FULL ENOUGH HEARING BY THOSE WHO REALLY DO THE WORK.	-0.5	1.0
50.	EVEN THOUGH I'M IN A ROLE SUPPOSEDLY VITAL TO PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, I OFTEN FEEL I AM NOT CONSULTED.	-1.2	-0.3
51.	I BELIEVE OUR PRESENT ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND PROCESS GIVES EVERYBODY A CHANCE TO HAVE HIS/HER SAY IN THINGS.	1.5	-0.9
52.	I THINK IT DOESN'T MATTER MUCH WHO ONE IS OR WHAT ONE DOES, THE MAJOR ISSUES AFFECTING EDUCATION PROGRAMS HERE ARE BEYOND THE EDUCATION UNIT'S CONTROL.	-0.9	1.0
53.	I HINK BEING ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES IN THE EDUCATION UNIT HELPS THOSE PEOPLE TO INFLUENCE WHAT GOES ON.	1.2	1.4
54.	I BELIEVE THAT BEING ON CERTAIN IMPORTANT COMMITTEES CAUSES PEOPLE TO ENDORSE THINGS THEY MIGHT OTHERWISE OPPOSE.	-0.1	-0.0
55.	I THINK ADMINISTRATORS TRY VERY HARD TO HELP EVERYBODY IN THE EDUCATION UNIT TO BECOME INVOLVED AND TO INFLUENCE DECISIONS AFFECTING PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT.	1.4	0.1
56.	I FEEL THAT EVEN SOME PEOPLE IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE HIERARCHY AREN'T INCLUDED IN SOME IMPORTANT DECISION-MAKING MATTERS.	-0.6	0.8
57.	I THINK THE GREAT BULK OF COMMITTEE WORK IS NOT GIVEN MUCH SERIOUS ATTENTION BY THE DEAN OR CHAIRMAN.	-1.5	-0.9
58.	I REALLY DEEP-DOWN DON'T LIKE BEING IDENTIFIED WITH EDUCATION HERE BECAUSE TOO MANY OF OUR STAFF IN THAT UNIT ARE PRETTY WEAK.	-1.9	-2.5
59.	I AM CONVINCED THAT WE DON'T REALLY GET OUR FAIR SHARE OF THE BETTER STUDENTS COMING INTO THE INSTITUTION.	-1.2	-1.4
60.	I THINK OUR COLLEAGUES IN DEPARTMENTS OUTSIDE THE EDUCATION UNIT DON'T REALLY HAVE MUCH RESPECT FOR US.	-0.7	0.7

	ITEM DESCRIPTIONS	TYPAL Z'S	
61.	I THINK SOME OF OUR COLLEAGUES OUTSIDE EDUCATION RATHER STRONGLY RESENT THE GENERALLY HIGH STATUS THAT EDUCATION ENJOYS HERE.	-0.3	-0.1
62.	I THINK PEOPLE GENERALLY--BOTH INSIDE AND OUTSIDE EDUCATION--BELIEVE THAT EDUCATION OVERALL ISN'T VERY STRONG.	-0.8	-0.0
63.	I THINK THINGS IN GENERAL AROUND HERE ORGANIZATIONALLY AND ADMINISTRATIVELY SO FAR AS EDUCATION IS CONCERNED ARE A LOT BETTER THAN MOST PEOPLE WOULD ADMIT.	1.3	0.7
64.	I GENERALLY FEEL THAT I KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON AND I HEAR ABOUT THINGS SOONER THAN MOST.	1.4	0.1
65.	I THINK THAT THERE IS FAR LESS AUTONOMY OVER OUR WORK AND PROGRAMS THAN WE OUGHT TO HAVE AS A GOOD ACADEMIC UNIT.	-0.7	-0.1
66.	I BELIEVE A LOT MORE COULD BE ACCOMPLISHED IF THERE WAS LESS INTERFERENCE WITH WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO IN EDUCATION AND PEOPLE INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE EDUCATION UNIT WOULD JUST LEAVE US BE.	-1.0	-0.8
67.	I THINK OUR RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER ACADEMIC UNITS AND PROGRAM AR BEING TOO MUCH, AND INCREASINGLY, DETERMINED BY THEM AND NOT US.	-1.2	0.2
68.	I THINK A DRASTIC REORGANIZATION OF THE EDUCATION UNIT HERE IS NOW ESSENTIAL.	-1.0	-0.5
69.	IF THE EDUCATION UNIT WERE REORGANIZED, I'D LIKE TO SEE STRUCTURE GIVEN MORE EMPHASIS THAN CERTAIN PEOPLE.	-0.1	0.6
70.	I DON'T REALLY SEE ANYTHING PARTICULARLY WRONG WITH THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE BUT CERTAIN PEOPLE OUGHT TO BE CHANGED.	-0.0	-0.8

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TYPES

	1	2
1	1.000	0.296
2	0.296	1.00

COMPARATIVE INSTITUTIONAL COMPLEXITY

1) Present position _____
2) Current teaching load _____ (credit hours)
3) Institutional Status: (Check each applicable)

A. Public _____
B. Private _____
C. General Purpose College _____
D. Teachers' College _____
e. University _____
f. Highest degree awarded in Education _____
g. Highest degree granted, any field _____

4) Years you have been at this institution:

_____ (one year) _____ (2-5 yrs.) _____ (more than 5 yrs.)

RESPOND BY CHECKING "STRONGLY AGREE" (SA); "AGREE" (A): "DISAGREE" (D); OR, "STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD).

I. Status of Organization

1) Professional Education programs are more important and visible in this institution than typically. (Your perception)	SA	A	D	SD
2) With reference to the allocation of resources, Education is treated as well as or better than other program areas.	SA	A	D	SD
3) In terms of faculty who have some influence in overall policy-making, Education faculty are generally very important.	SA	A	D	SD
4) Personalities are important variables in the relative status of programs but in our case Education is highly important regardless of leadership because of institutional commitment.	SA	A	D	SD
5) Education's status in the whole scheme of the institution has prospered primarily because of our leadership's style.	SA	A	D	SD
6) This institution's general and traditional commitment to Education programs has declined primarily due to explicit plans to change the image of the place.	SA	A	D	SD
7) A "Teacher's College" reputation is looked upon here generally as a genuine strength.	SA	A	D	SD
8) Teacher preparation is perceived here as only one among various program options -- neither more nor less important than others.	SA	A	D	SD
9) Faculty in the Education unit here generally take expressive pride in their place in things and see themselves as a leading constituency.	SA	A	D	SD
10) Students coming into Education programs are generally perceived as having to be better than the average at the institution.	SA	A	D	SD

11) Students in Education programs typically dominate in influence in student organizations.

SA A D SD

12) Program revisions in Teacher Education curricula involving non-Education content are not too difficult to effect here.

SA A D SD

13) Cooperation with liberal arts faculty regarding Teacher Education programs is more difficult now than in the past.

SA A D SD

14) I would surmise that the overall commitment to Teacher Education dominates this institution's purposes.

SA A D SD

II. Internal Heirarchy

15) In the general structure of things, Education faculty are pretty much "in the know" around here.

SA A D SD

16) There is a fairly effective information-flow pattern in this institution.

SA A D SD

17) If anything important is being proposed, Education faculty are the last to hear about it.

SA A D SD

18) Even though some people are higher in the general institutional heirarchy than I am, I know what's going on about as quickly as they do.

SA A D SD

19) Frequently here, some people who are fairly high-up in the organizational structure don't know about things that are being considered until they are decided.

SA A D SD

20) Since professional Education is very important here, things that affect non-Education programs are frequently perceived by those non-Education people as being done without their in-put.

SA A D SD

21) A lot more decisions are now being made that effect Educational programs that even our own faculty and administration in Teacher Education have little control over.

SA A D SD

22) Too frequently now as compared to the recent past, faculty or staff who are somewhat outside the "inner-sanctum" don't quite know how to respond to new procedures.

SA A D SD

23) People whose job it is to advise students are increasingly frustrated by changes in procedures or requirements that they don't know enough about.

SA A D SD

24) When staff who have a responsibility to advise students or to work with something different aren't made clearly aware of it, they have to react by what they think rather than what the system really wants.

SA A D SD

25) One really knows more about what is going on here if he/she is just "officed" closer to people who make decisions.

SA A D SD

26) It seems to be true that by the time something decided gets to some people who've little to do with it, it's pretty badly distorted.

SA A D SD

27) One thing seems sure -- in the last couple of years here, there has been a lot of confusion among faculty about what is expected of them in Teacher Education programs.

SA A D SD

28) People who have been involved in departmental or college decisions because of their positions in the heirarchy generally seem no more well-informed than others.

SA A D SD

29) The organizational structure of the Education unit here is not very complex and since there are only a few people involved in decision-making, there seems to be less distortion of information dissemination.

SA A D SD

30) The organizational structure here is fairly complex (e.g., there are several assistant deans, department chairpersons, committees, and problems with non-Education curricula personnel) thus it's much more difficult to know what is expected.

SA A D SD

31) We probably ought to have more meetings of staff here in order for everybody to know more about what is going on.

SA A D SD

32) It's apparently easy for people involved in various decision-making functions to overlook some staff who ought to be informed about those decisions.

SA A D SD

33) Most of our staff don't especially feel left-out so far as knowing about what's going on that affects them or their programs.

SA A D SD

34) Since our Education component is not very influential in the whole scheme of things, our problem is getting enough attention rather than too much.

SA A D SD

35) In this institution, we've perceived a decided shift away from very much importance given to Education programs even though perceptions among most people here is that such programs still reflect the most visible sources of prestige and function.

SA A D SD

36) If this institution were to be redesignated as a Teachers' College probably most of the faculty even in Education would object.

SA A D SD

Part III. Idiosyncratic Concerns

37) I think most of the faculty assigned to Education programs here take immense pride in that identification.

SA A D SD

38) If the majority of our faculty could be assured of continuing employment, I think they wouldn't be at all that disturbed if Education programs were discontinued.

SA A D SD

39) I think almost all of our faculty in Education would be very upset if such programs were discontinued even if faculty were assured of continued tenure.

SA A D SD

40) Most of the people I know in the Education faculty take their work in Teacher Preparation very seriously and work very hard at it.

SA A D SD

41) I believe professional Education programs here do not enough value contributions of people in my kind of role.

SA A D SD

42) I believe that in the allocation of resources, not enough consideration is given to teaching.

SA A D SD

43) I believe that the factors affecting resources-decisions for Education programs with the Education unit are not well-understood by Faculty.

SA A D SD

44) I believe that authorities in central administration do not take Education seriously enough in terms of resources-allocation.

SA A D SD

45) I believe those in our staff - faculty and administration - who have influence in the institution do not fight hard enough for our fair share of resources.

SA A D SD

46) I'm convinced that people outside Education aren't made to realize how much Education programs contribute to the overall generation of student-credit-hours.

SA A D SD

47) I believe too much attention is given to the business of declining markets for teachers.

SA A D SD

48) I believe there are people in our staff whose potential for influence in Teacher Education is not recognized enough.

SA A D SD

49) I am convinced that too many decisions are made which do not get a full enough hearing by those who really do the work.

SA A D SD

50) Even though I'm in a role supposedly vital to program development, I often feel I am not consulted.

SA A D SD

51) I believe our present organizational structure and process gives everybody a change to have his/her say in things.

SA A D SD

52) I think it doesn't matter much who one is or what one does, the major issues affecting Education programs here are beyond the Education Unit's control.

SA A D SD

53) I think being on certain committees in the Education unit helps those people to influence what goes on.

SA A D SD

54) I believe that being on certain important committees causes people to endorse things they might otherwise oppose.

SA A D SD

55) I think administrators try very hard to help everybody in the Education unit to become involved and to influence decisions affecting program development.

SA A D SD

56) I feel that even some people in the administrative hierarchy aren't included in some important decision-making matters.

SA A D SD

57) I think the great bulk of committee work is not given much serious attention by the Dean or Chairman.

SA A D SD

58) I really, deep-down, don't like being identified with Education here because too many of our staff in that unit are pretty weak.

SA A D SD

59) I am convinced that we don't really get our fair share of the better students coming into the institution.

SA A D SD

60) I think our colleagues in departments outside the Education unit don't really have much respect for us.

SA A D SD

61) I think some of our colleagues outside Education rather strongly resent the generally high status that Education enjoys here.

SA A D SD

62) I think people here generally - both inside and outside Education - believe that Education overall isn't very strong.

SA A D SD

63) I think things in general around here organizationally and administratively so far as Education is concerned are a lot better than most people would admit.

SA A D SD

64) I generally feel that I know what is going on and I hear about things sooner than most.

SA A D SD

65) I think that there is far less autonomy over our work and programs than we ought to have as a good academic unit.

SA A D SD

66) I believe a lot more could be accomplished if there was less interference with what we're trying to do in Education and people inside and outside the Education unit would just leave us be.

SA A D SD

67) I think our relationships with other academic units and programs are being too much, and increasingly, determined by them and not us.

SA A D SD

68) I think a drastic reorganization of the Education unit here is now essential.

SA A D SD

69) If the Education unit were reorganized, I'd like to see structure given more emphasis than certain people.

SA A D SD

70) I don't really see anything particularly wrong with the organizational structure but certain people ought to be changed.

SA A D SD